

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 8, 10-11, 12-15 and 17-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Hess (US 6,062,585). Claims 5-7, 13 and 19-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Hess.

Claim 1, as amended, features a ski having a planar running surface and ski edges, each ski edge having a second surface that lies substantially in the plane defined by the planar running surface, for contact with the skiing surface when the running surface is flat on the skiing surface. Similarly, amended claim 10 recites that the edge tip that is formed by the exposed inner side and corresponding outer side of the ski edge lies substantially in the plane defined by the planar running surface, for contact with the skiing surface when the running surface is flat on the skiing surface. This geometry allows the ski edges to engage the snow surface substantially continuously, not just when the ski is turned on edge, supporting a new skiing technique called “gliding” or “pure carving.”

Hess does not teach or suggest a ski in which a second surface or edge tip of each ski edge lies in the plane of the running surface for contact with the skiing surface when the running surface is flat on the skiing surface. Rather, Hess teaches explicitly *away* from such a geometry, stating that it is undesirable to have the ski edges “located at the level of contact or running surface of the ski with a consequence that the edges are permanently in action and the ski will be difficult to maneuver because the edges will continuously cut into the snow” (col. 1, lines 38-42.) Hess repeatedly emphasizes that the edges should not contact the snow when the running surface of the ski is flat on the snow, but instead only when the ski is tilted to initiate a turn. (See, e.g., col. 4, lines 55-61.) To avoid contact of the edges with the snow when the running surface is flat on the snow, Hess positions each edge “at a distance from the running surface so that the external edge is not permanently engaged” (col. 2, lines 1-5). This is achieved by “inclining the edge with a slight angle...increasing the distance between the external edge and the ground” (col. 2, lines 5-9). This vertical separation or “free space” between the external edge and the ground is evident in all of Hess’s figures, and is described at col. 4, lines 12-13, 29-31, 48-49 and 57-62.

Applicant : Anton F. Wilson
Serial No. : 10/603,248
Filed : June 25, 2003
Page : 7 of 7

Attorney's Docket No.: 17984-003001

Thus, Hess does not teach or suggest Applicant's invention as now claimed. In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under §§102 and 103 be withdrawn.


Applicant respectfully submits that the art cited but not relied upon by the Examiner does not supply that which is lacking in the Hess reference.

It is believed that no fees are due with this response. However, please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 17984-003001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: AUGUST 19, 2005

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906


Celia H. Leber
Reg. No. 33,524

GREGORY A. WILKES
FOR :
REG. No. 41,366